



Independent observer
of the Global Fund

THE MAJOR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS TO THE FUND

Chapter 3 of “The Aidspan Guide to Round 6 Applications to the Global Fund” discusses the strengths and weaknesses of applications submitted in Rounds 3, 4 and 5. The list provided is based on an extensive analysis of comments made on those applications by the TRP.

The main strengths that the TRP has mentioned are as follows:

1. The proposal was clear and well-documented; the strategy was sound.
2. There was good involvement of partners (including NGOs and other sectors) in the implementation plan.
3. There was a strong political commitment to implement the programme.
4. The proposal demonstrated complementarity – i.e., it built on existing activities, including national strategic plans, and/or it built on earlier programmes financed by the Global Fund.
5. The programme targeted high-risk groups and vulnerable populations.
6. The proposal demonstrated sustainability – i.e., national budgets were identified to help sustain the activities once Global Fund support terminated.
7. The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan was solid.
8. The budget was well detailed.
9. There was good collaboration among programmes addressing the three diseases.
10. The proposal contained a good situational analysis.
11. The proposal reflected comments made by the TRP during earlier rounds of funding.
12. The goals, objectives, activities, outcomes and budgets were well aligned.
13. The CCM was strong and had wide sectoral representation.
14. The programme was realistic with respect to what could be accomplished and/or had a limited and

concentrated focus.

15. The proposal demonstrated good co-funding.
16. The PR is a strong organisation, with experience managing similar programmes.
17. The proposal contained innovative strategies, some of which could lead to best practices.
18. The proposal built on lessons learned and best practices.
19. The proposal included capacity building measures and identified technical support needs.
20. The proposal had a strong human rights focus.
21. The proposal contained a strong gender analysis and strategy.

The main weaknesses that the TRP has mentioned are as follows:

1. The workplan was inadequate. There was insufficient, unclear or questionable information on one or more of the following: the rationale, the strategic approach, the objectives, the activities and the expected outcomes.
2. The budget information was inaccurate, questionable and/or not sufficiently detailed.
3. The proposal did not demonstrate complementarity or additionality; it was not clear how the programme related or added to existing programmes, including programmes funded by the Global Fund.
4. The proposal did not contain a good situational (i.e., gap) analysis.
5. There were problems concerning the PR.
6. The various sections of the proposal were not well aligned.
7. The M&E plan was either missing or inadequate.
8. In HIV/AIDS and TB proposals, there were either no joint activities or insufficient joint activities involving both diseases.
9. The programme was too ambitious; some or all of the goals and objectives were not realistic.
10. The use of partners (including NGOs) in the implementation of the programme was inadequate or unclear.
11. The impact and/or outcome indicators were inappropriate or poorly defined.
12. The programme did not focus sufficiently on vulnerable groups.
13. The plan for procurement and supply chain management was inadequate.
14. There were problems with the structure or functioning of the CCM.
15. The proposal did not adequately explain the roles and responsibilities of the various players.
16. The proposal failed to adequately address issues of capacity building and technical assistance.
17. Some of the proposed approaches or activities were inappropriate.
18. The proposal development process was not sufficiently transparent or inclusive.
19. The proposal demonstrated insufficient co-funding.
20. The proposal failed to address weakness identified by the TRP for proposals submitted in earlier rounds of funding.
21. Insufficient attention was paid to human rights issues.
22. The budget (and therefore the programme) was imbalanced; too much or too little was allocated to one or more sectors or activities.
23. The treatment, care and support component of the proposal was missing or inadequate.

“The Aidsplan Guide to Round 6 Applications to the Global Fund” discusses all of these in detail, and provides links to proposals and TRP comments that provide illustrations of the strengths.

Applicants might also wish to study the TRP’s detailed report to the Board on Round 5 proposals, accessible at www.theglobalfund.org/en/files/boardmeeting11/gfb116.pdf.

[Read More](#)
